<center>REMARKS</center>

Claims 1-10 and 12-37 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Additionally, applicants' representative thanks Examiner Woo for the teleconference of June 12, 2007. The merits of the claims in view of the cited references were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I.   **Rejection of Claims 1-10 and 12-37 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 7, 12-31 and 34-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conklin (US 6,415,283) in view of Risvik (US 6,377,945). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Neither Conklin nor Risvik, teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

> To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant's claimed invention relates to architecture for generating meaningful names for a flattened data structure. By observing user activity associated with a hierarchical data structure, the system generates meaningful names that help to simplify browsing of computer network shares. In particular, independent claim 1 recites *a computer implemented system that facilitates the generation of meaningful description for a flattened data structure, comprising a data structure having a plurality of data nodes, **a valuation component that assigns a valuation to one or more of the data nodes in accordance with a predetermined metric, the metric is at***

<center>2</center>

least one time the node was accessed, that the node was modified, when the node was modified, that the node was copied, when the node was copied, an access frequency, or a number of unique users who have accessed the node and a description component that generates a description that represents at least one of the one or more data nodes that is selected according to the metric. Independent claims 16, 23 and 33 recite similar limitations. Conklin and Risvik either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest such novel aspects of applicant's claimed invention.

Conklin discloses a cluster processing system that determines at least one focal node on a hierarchically arranged tree structure of nodes based on attributes of a data set. As conceded by the Examiner on page 4 of the Final Office Action, Conklin does not teach or suggest *a valuation component that assigns a valuation to one or more of the data nodes* in accordance with a predetermined metric, the metric is at least one of time the node was accessed, that the node was modified, when the node was modified, that the node was copied, when the node was copied, an access frequency, or a number of unique users who have accessed the node. The Examiner attempts to compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of Conklin with Risvik.

Risvik relates to a search system for information retrieval in large volumes of data. At the cited portions, Risvik discloses a system that matches words or symbols in a query with the words or symbols in a text by utilizing an edit distance metric. The edit distance metric is the calculated minimum sum of costs for edit operations performed, for transforming a word s in the text to a word q in the query. However, Risvik does not teach a valuation component that *assigns a valuation* to one or more of the data nodes. Hence, Risvik is silent regarding *a valuation component that assigns a valuation to one or more of the data nodes in accordance with a predetermined metric, the metric is at least one time the node was accessed, that the node was modified, when the node was modified, that the node was copied, when the node was copied, an access frequency, or a number of unique users who have accessed the node and a description component that generates a description that represents at least one of the one or more data nodes that is selected according to the metric* as recited by the subject claims.

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Conklin and Risvik either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the applicant's subject claims. Accordingly it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

<div align="center">CONCLUSION</div>

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP639US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

                              Respectfully submitted,

                              AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

                              /Himanshu S. Amin/
                              Himanshu S. Amin
                              Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731